

The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 6, 1873.

Advertisements to be made at the office of the Sun, No. 100 Nassau street, New York, at the rate of \$1.00 per line for the first week, and \$0.50 for each subsequent week. For the accommodation of our readers, we have a special rate for advertisements in the "What Do We Want?" column, at the rate of \$0.25 per line for the first week, and \$0.125 for each subsequent week. For the accommodation of our readers, we have a special rate for advertisements in the "What Do We Want?" column, at the rate of \$0.25 per line for the first week, and \$0.125 for each subsequent week.

Advertisements to be made at the office of the Sun, No. 100 Nassau street, New York, at the rate of \$1.00 per line for the first week, and \$0.50 for each subsequent week. For the accommodation of our readers, we have a special rate for advertisements in the "What Do We Want?" column, at the rate of \$0.25 per line for the first week, and \$0.125 for each subsequent week. For the accommodation of our readers, we have a special rate for advertisements in the "What Do We Want?" column, at the rate of \$0.25 per line for the first week, and \$0.125 for each subsequent week.

For the accommodation of our readers, we have a special rate for advertisements in the "What Do We Want?" column, at the rate of \$0.25 per line for the first week, and \$0.125 for each subsequent week. For the accommodation of our readers, we have a special rate for advertisements in the "What Do We Want?" column, at the rate of \$0.25 per line for the first week, and \$0.125 for each subsequent week.

The Constitution says that all trials shall be by jury, and that no person shall be convicted of a crime until he has been tried by a jury. This is a fundamental principle of our government, and it is one that should be strictly adhered to in all cases.

An act was passed by the last Congress increasing the pay of the members of both Houses, the Representatives and the Senators. The bill was passed by a large majority, and it is now the law of the land.

The bill was passed by a large majority, and it is now the law of the land. The bill was passed by a large majority, and it is now the law of the land. The bill was passed by a large majority, and it is now the law of the land.

There has been a great outcry against this. It has excited, toward those who voted for it, a very strong feeling of indignation. The bill was passed by a large majority, and it is now the law of the land.

What is to be done about it? Elect to the next Congress other men, who did not vote for this act, is the ready response. The bill was passed by a large majority, and it is now the law of the land.

Is that enough—is that all that we ought to do? Many of the men who voted for this law would never have voted for it—would have both voted and declined against it—if they had the slightest idea how unpopular it would be.

Not only is this true, but the converse of the proposition is equally true; many candidates for Congress who hope to obtain seats by their denunciation of this law, would have voted for it if they had been members when it passed.

This is the truth; they not look the truth in the face? What is to be done in the future about this law?

It is hardly worth while for the people to delude themselves with the idea that it will be repealed. Such action as its repeal is not common. It never will be repealed until the world shall have been greatly improved. There is no probability that there will be any more legislation on that subject for a long while to come.

merely to exchange the present members for men who did not happen—simply by chance did not happen—to vote for that law might be a very small improvement, if any, in the character of the National Legislature.

What we want, what we need, is not simply a change to men whose votes do not appear among the Ayes on the passage of that bill; but men whose political convictions and whose moral principles would prevent the possibility of their votes being recorded for any other measure equally obnoxious to criticism from the most exalted plane of duty.

What is what we want; how to attain it is another question.

The Central Pacific Ring. The managers of the Central Pacific Ring are very shrewd. Long ago they determined to prevent the present members from doing anything that would lead to a public exposure of their operations, and when BRANNAN and LAMARCO brought their suit against the company to compel a statement of accounts by the Contract and Finance Company, STANFORD, HENTINGTON & Co. decided it was to pay these gentlemen \$500,000 for the 1.1 shares of stock they owned to allow them to come into court and disclose all they knew about the Credit Mobilier of the Pacific coast. They thought by compromising with these men and buying up their stock with Placer and Sacramento counties they had placed all inquiry into the character of their proceedings.

But the Central Pacific gentlemen were greatly disappointed in their expectations. To their great surprise the Supervisors of Placer county refused to be satisfied with receiving par value for their 2,500 shares of the hitherto unprofitable stock of the Central Pacific road. When they learned the terms of the compromise made with BRANNAN and LAMARCO it occurred to them that they had lost \$250,000 by selling to the first man who came along, and so they brought suit to recover the profits that had accrued on their stock prior to the sale.

If this suit had been brought by private individuals there can be no doubt that STANFORD, HENTINGTON & Co. would willingly have paid a million to have it discontinued. But it was brought by county officials the Ring resorted to a different method for protecting themselves, and the course they took in this instance affords an excellent illustration of the means largely used by this gentry. They concluded it was cheaper to manipulate the primary elections than to pay a vast sum of money as a compromise, and they succeeded in having candidates of their own selection nominated and elected as the Supervisors and law officers of Placer and Sacramento counties. The consequence is that the Placer county suit has never been safe from any prosecution on the part of the present officials of Sacramento county.

Many persons think that the allegations made against the managers of the Central Pacific road in the Placer county bill in equity were extravagant, but the following extract from testimony taken in the Fourth District Court of California is alone sufficient to show the enormous profits made by the Ring through its Credit Mobilier operations. A case was on trial in

which it became necessary to show the value of two hundred shares of Central Pacific stock, and JOHN B. FELTON, one of the counsel in the case of BRANNAN and LAMARCO against the Central Pacific Railroad, was examined. Here are some extracts from his testimony:

Q.—Have you any knowledge of 200 shares of Central Pacific Railroad stock owned by BRANNAN & Co.?

A.—I have.

Q.—You know of any proposition for the compromise or purchase of that stock made to Mr. BRANNAN & Co. and if so, when, by whom, and the amount of it?

A.—About a week prior to the commencement of this suit, Mr. STANFORD, President of the Pacific Railroad Company, offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

Q.—You say that the stock was offered to be purchased at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares?

A.—Yes, sir. I saw Mr. STANFORD, and he offered to purchase the stock at \$17.50 per share, which would make about \$3,500 for the 200 shares.

ing annuities measure by which he will be enriched by one hundred thousand dollars.

Will New Jersey Speak?

New Jersey holds an election this fall which, though not so important as that of next year, will nevertheless cause politicians to meet in county conventions all over the State. This will afford Republicans and Democrats an opportunity to express their opinions concerning the conduct of their Senators and Representatives in Congress in respect to that living issue of the times, the back-pay steal. To enable these conventions to free their minds on this subject we will point to the record of their Congressmen.

Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN, the Republican Senator, sent his extra pay to the Treasury some time since. JOHN P. STOCKTON, his Democratic colleague, still sticks to the plunder.

The delegation in the lower House of the Forty-second Congress consisted of three Republicans and two Democrats. Two of the former have returned their back pay; these are JOHN HILL, who resides in the northwest part of the State, and GEORGE A. HALEY of Newark. Neither of these gentlemen was reflected last fall. Senator FREELINGHUYSEN and Messrs. HILL and HALEY are all of the New Jersey Congressmen who have come to thrust their hands into the Treasury and draw therefrom extra compensation for work already performed at rates previously agreed upon.

Three members kept the money. They are JOHN W. HAZELTON, Republican, and SAMUEL C. FORKOR and JOHN T. BIRBY, Democrats. HAZELTON is the only New Jersey member of the Congress who was reflected to the present House. He represents the southern district, which is largely under the influence of the Cameron Ring of Philadelphia politicians. He is a man of no mark, having been placed sixth on the Agricultural Committee; and if the honest Jerseymen whom he disgraces in Congress had dreamed that he would have participated in a thieving job like the salary steal, they would have beaten him out of sight last November. They ought now to denounce him and demand his resignation.

And what excuse is there for the two Democrats, FORKOR of Bordentown, and BIRBY of Flemington? When assembled in their conventions this fall will not the Democracy whom they have betrayed stain their white with the cry, "Send back the stolen money!"

Can Gov. PARKER afford to have the Democrats of the State keep silence in regard to the conduct of STOCKTON, FORKOR, and BIRBY on this test question?

Removed Sale of the Old Long Island Railroad.

A rumor prevailed the latter part of last week that Mr. OLIVER CHARLICK had sold his interest in the old Long Island road through the middle of the Long Island tunneling from Hunter's Point to Greenport, with several branches. The purchasers were said to be the present owners of the South Side road.

Whether there is in fact any foundation for the report we do not know. People who profess to be thoroughly informed put it in circulation. But we hope it is not true. The interest of the public is to have the lines of travel competing instead of having them concentrated in the same hands. Mr. CHARLICK, notwithstanding his unpopularity, has managed his railroad well—in most respects very well. He has greatly improved the road bed in many places, and has replaced the defective ties and rails by new ones of superior quality. The trains are generally run on time, and at a fair rate of speed. It is true, as was recently charged by the New York Times, that a considerable portion of the road still remains unfenced; but no steps are taken to enforce the law which requires it to be fenced, and probably no other owner would do any better than Mr. CHARLICK in this respect. The allegation of the Times that the conductors are rude must have resulted from misinformation. We know of no road in the country on which not only the conductors, but all the persons employed, are more uniformly polite.

But the principal and so important of all roads, is the fact that the road has not sold out. It is the road in run with remarkable success in point of safety; and in this essential we fear that any change in the management would be for the worse.

Judge STONEY of Wisconsin, who presides over a United States District Court in Arkansas, has become involved in a difficulty which is likely to lead to an investigation into his official conduct. About one year ago Dr. FRANK NASH of Fort Gibson, Cherokee Nation, was indicted for selling whiskey and violating the interstate law and taking to Fort Smith for trial; but although witnesses were present to testify in his case, a nolle proes was entered and NASH was released. About one year ago Dr. FRANK NASH of Fort Gibson, Cherokee Nation, was indicted for selling whiskey and violating the interstate law and taking to Fort Smith for trial; but although witnesses were present to testify in his case, a nolle proes was entered and NASH was released.

Why he did this was a mystery to his friends at first, but after a time the rumor gained currency that he had given his note for \$250 to Judge STONEY and another for \$50 to Mr. HENRY, the District Attorney. Judge STONEY, becoming indignant that his colleague should be assailed in such a manner, ordered the United States Marshal, as we are informed, to arrest NASH and bring him before the Court for contempt. Without waiting for NASH to make his appearance in Fort Smith, but the United States Marshal, as we are informed, to arrest NASH and bring him before the Court for contempt.

The matter coming to the ears of the Grand Jury that body endeavored to investigate the business but failed, as NASH refuses to answer any questions, and the attendance of Deputy Marshal STEPHENSON, who it is said can show a good deal of light on the subject, could not be procured. Thus the affair stands at present, but measures are on foot to secure a thorough investigation. There have been some very curious judicial proceedings in Arkansas since GRANT began removing court officers for attempting to enforce the laws.

Switzerland is making another attempt to amend its Constitution. Article forty-eight of the bill recently introduced for the revision of this instrument provides that there shall be complete freedom of conscience and creed; that civil and political rights shall not be made dependent on any regulations or conditions of a religious nature; and that no one shall be compelled to pay taxes for religious purposes.

The body of which he is not a member, but Switzerland is not yet willing to let religion alone, for the article also provides that the establishment of bishoprics shall be subject to the approval of the Confederation.

The Canadians are in a high state of excitement over the efforts made by their Ministry to prevent a fair investigation of the charges of corruption in regard to the contracts for constructing the proposed Canadian Pacific Railroad. The next session of Parliament begins by law on the 10th of this month, and the people demand an investigation by the House of Commons. The Ministry, however, prefer to have the investigation confined to the hands of their friends, and have already decided to appoint a royal commission, composed of persons to be named by themselves, to take charge

of the inquiry; and they threaten to prorogue Parliament until after the close of the session, thus preventing the House of Commons from interfering in the matter. All this has only had the effect of intensifying popular indignation, as the art of official whitewashing is not much appreciated in Canada.

The death of Dr. WILBERFORCE, the late Bishop of Winchester, was caused by the stumbling of his horse.

Lord GRANVILLE's groom testified at the inquest: "The Bishop was riding at a slow, cantering pace, and was going very quietly. There was no fault to be found with the horse, and the accident was entirely due to the Bishop's own carelessness."

A dragon officer writing to the London Times says that there is no more dangerous place on road or turf than a "rocking-horse center" for an easy-going horse and a loose rein; that twice in his career he has rolled his horse and rider over a "rocking-horse center," and that a loose rein is the preventive. He writes:

"During an experience extending now over thirty years I never knew a horse to fall from a stumble that was not due to a loose rein. I have seen many a horse rider, and I am sure, that if he had a tight rein, he would not have fallen. I have seen many a horse rider, and I am sure, that if he had a tight rein, he would not have fallen."

Who shall decide when doctors disagree? The question is a very old one, and it is one that is still being debated. The question is a very old one, and it is one that is still being debated.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

There is a story told of an eminent criminal lawyer—it might have been BEN BUTLER—who on one occasion made such a powerful plea in favor of a notorious thief on trial that not only did the jury acquit the rascal, but one of the Jurymen remarked on being discharged that he felt a disposition to go out and steal some more money.

A COLORED CAMP MEETING.

BROTHER JENKINS'S FAIR EFFORT TO DRAW A CROWD.

Two Preachers but no Congregation—Only a few people on the Ground—The Blind Preacher's sermon to Brother Jenkins and a Sun Reporter.

In Kunkle's Grove, two miles from Rahway, New Jersey, a camp meeting is being held by colored Methodists; but it is a camp meeting in name only, there being no tents, and since Sunday last scarcely any attendance. The Rev. Isaac Jenkins, who has charge of the meeting, says that he has made every effort in vain to attract a crowd. He has distributed handbills, advertised tens to let, and sent invitations to Zion congregations far and near, but he has received no response of consequence. One of the attractions extensively advertised by Brother Jenkins, and relied upon to draw an attendance, was "the Rev. Rowland William Ford, the Blind Preacher, the World's Wonder." The following is an extract from a bill which gives

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."

THE WONDER OF THE EXPERIENCE: "I was born in Prince George's county, Maryland, Sept. 1, 1812. At the age of five years I was taken blind, and I have never since seen the light. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old. I was educated in the common schools of my native county, and I was able to read and write before I was five years old."